

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/06877 (equivalent US 6,707,515, Ide et al.) in view of Fukutani et al (US 5,264,952).

Since the WO 99/06877 is published in Japanese, the equivalent US 6,707,515 (Ide et al) is relied upon in the rejection for the ease of discussions.

Ide et al disclose in Figs. 1-3 a composite display unit having a first display element 18 and a second display element 16 that is provided overlapping the first display element, wherein the first display element 18 comprises: a liquid crystal panel in which a liquid crystal layer 3 is held between first and second transparent substrates (1, 2); and a reflective polarization plate 14 that transmits light that oscillates in a specified direction and reflects light that oscillates in a direction that is intersecting with the specified direction and which is disposed on the liquid crystal panel on the side of the first transparent substrate wherein the second display element 16 comprises: a liquid crystal panel in which a liquid crystal layer 3 is held between third and fourth transparent substrates (1,2), and wherein the third transparent substrate 2 of the second display element 16 is provided on the side of the second transparent substrate 1 of the first display

element 18 and an absorption polarization plate 12 is further provided on the side of the fourth transparent substrate 1 of the second display element 16. The reflective polarization plate 14 is DBEF (trade name) manufactured by Sumitomo 3M that is constituted as a dielectric multi-layered film with birefringence. As apparent from Figs. 2 and 3, the second display element 16 performs a *one-segment* display and the first display element 18 performs a dot-matrix display (col. 4, line 18 – col. 6, line 67).

Thus, the only difference between the composite display unit of Ide et al and that of the instant claims is Ide et al are silent about the reflective polarization plate 14 being directly joined to the first transparent substrate of the first display element 18, and the second transparent substrate of the first display element 18 being directly joined to the third transparent substrate of the second display element 16. However, Fukutani et al disclose in Fig. 35 that in a composite unit, a polarization plate 75 is directly joined to the first transparent substrate 64b of the first display element 62, and the second transparent substrate 64a of the first display element 62 is directly joined to the third transparent substrate 71b of the second display element 63 (col. 36, line 64 – col. 37, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art in view of Fukutani et al to employ in the composite display unit of Ide et al the reflective polarization plate 14 being directly joined to the first transparent substrate of the first display element 18, and the second transparent substrate of the first display element 18 being directly joined to the third transparent substrate

of the second display element 16 for reducing unwanted reflections and optical losses associated with the air gaps between the reflective polarization plate and the first transparent substrate of the first display element, between the second transparent substrate of the first display element and the third transparent substrate of the second display element.

With respect to Applicant's remarks regarding that the reflection-type polarizing film 14 of Ide et al or the DBEF (trade name) manufactured by Sumitomo 3M is *not* a dielectric multi-layered film with birefringence, the Higashi et al (paragraph 0016), Tominaga et al (col. 6, lines 4-11) and Okumura (col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 10) references are cited as evidences to support the examiner's assertion that the DBEF from Sumitomo 3M *is* a dielectric multi-layered film with birefringence.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ide et al (equivalent US 6,707,515) and Fukutani et al (US 5,264,952) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Okumura (US 6,008,871).

The only difference between the display unit cited in the above rejection of claim 1 and that of the instant claim is the dielectric multi-layered film comprising two macromolecular layers with different light elastic moduli. It is noted that the instant specification discloses on page 13 that the two macromolecular layers are PEN (2,6-polyethylene naphthalate) and coPEN (70-naphthalate/30-terephthalate copolyester) layers. Okumura discloses a reflective polarizer comprising PEN and coPEN layers (col. 7, lines 11-49). Thus, it would have been

obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art in view of Okumura to employ a reflective polarizer comprising two macromolecular layers with different light elastic moduli in the display unit cited in the above rejection of claim 1 for obtaining a thin and bright reflective polarizer, as compared with reflective polarizers of other types.

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons mentioned in the above rejections.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number (571) 272-2291.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

TVD
04/08

/Dung Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2871